

REMARKS

Claims 1-9, 14-23, 25, and 27 are pending. The Examiner's reconsideration of the rejections is respectfully requested in view of the amendments and remarks.

Claim 1 has been objected to as being "worded confusingly." Claim 1 has been amended to clarify the claimed configuration. Reconsideration of the objection is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-5, 10-18 and 23-31 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Parise (USPN 6,114,834 & 6,792,259, hereinafter Parise '834 and Parise '259). The Examiner stated essentially that the individually teachings of Parise '834 and Parise '259 teach all the limitations of Claims 1-5, 10-18 and 23-31.

Claim 1 claims, *inter alia*, "a charging device, the charging device comprising an upper base, a lower base, at least one outer wall connecting the lower base to the upper base and at least one inner wall extending from the upper base towards the lower base, wherein the at least one inner wall does not contact to the lower base and wherein at least one laser source is disposed in the upper base." Claim 23 claims, *inter alia*, "at least one outer wall connecting the lower base to the upper base; and at least one inner wall extending from the upper based towards the lower base, wherein the at least one inner wall does not contact to the lower base."

Parise '834 and Parise '259 each teach a system and method for wireless energy transmission, and more particularly to a method for charging a battery powered motor vehicle. Neither Parise '834 nor Parise '259 teach "a charging device, the charging device comprising an upper base, a lower base, at least one outer wall connecting the lower base to the upper base and at least one inner wall extending from the upper base towards the lower base, wherein the at least

one inner wall does not contact to the lower base and wherein at least one laser source is disposed in the upper base” as claimed in Claim 1, or “at least one outer wall connecting the lower base to the upper base; and at least one inner wall extending from the upper base towards the lower base, wherein the at least one inner wall does not contact to the lower base” as claimed in Claim 23.

Referring more particularly to Claims 1 and 23; Parise ‘834 and Parise ‘259 each individually fail to teach “at least one inner wall extending from the upper base towards the lower base, wherein the at least one inner wall does not contact to the lower base” as claimed in Claims 1 and 23. For example, the rechargeable device of Parise ‘834 and Parise ‘259 is mounted within a motor vehicle while the charging device is mounted on a structure outside of the motor vehicle (see for example, Figures 1 of Parise ‘834 and Parise ‘259). The garage of Parise ‘834 and Parise ‘259 (see FIG. 10) includes walls supporting a structure. The garage of Parise ‘834 and Parise ‘259 clearly does not include “at least one inner wall extending from the upper base towards the lower base, wherein the at least one inner wall does not contact to the lower base” as claimed in Claims 1 and 23. Therefore, Parise ‘834 and Parise ‘259 each individually fail to teach all the limitations of Claims 1 and 23.

Further, the rejection fails to address the claimed structure of the charging device (e.g., the inner and outer walls), suggesting that the claimed invention represents “rearranging parts”, which involves only routine skill in the art. Applicants note that the cited references have not been shown to include the claimed “parts.” Thus, the claimed invention represents more than a mere rearrangement of parts. It would seem incumbent on the Examiner to point to the parts supposedly rearranged in order to support such a rejection. Therefore, the rejection fails to make out a *prima facie* case of obviousness in view of Parise ‘834 and Parise ‘259.

Claims 2-5 and 10-18 depend from Claim 1. Claims 25 and 27 depend from Claim 23. The dependent claims are believed to be allowable for at least the reasons given for respective independent claims.

The Examiner's reconsideration of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Claims 6-9 and 19-22 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Parise (USPN 6,114,834 & 6,792,259). The Examiner stated essentially that the combined teachings of Parise '834 and Parise '259 teach or suggest all the limitations of Claims 6-9 and 19-22.

Claims 6-9 and 19-22 depend from Claim 1. The dependent claims are believed to be allowable for at least the reasons given for Claim 1. The Examiner's reconsideration of the rejection is respectfully requested.

For the forgoing reasons, the present application, including claims 1-9, 14-23, 25, and 27, is believed to be in condition for allowance. The Examiner's early and favorable action is respectfully urged.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: February 29, 2008

/Nathaniel T. Wallace/
Nathaniel T. Wallace
Reg. No. 48,909
Attorney for Applicants

F. CHAU & ASSOCIATES, LLC
130 Woodbury Road
Woodbury, New York 11797
TEL: (516) 692-8888
FAX: (516) 692-8889